



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Community research

Briefing slides

for remote evaluation of
FP7-HEALTH-2010-single stage
Infectious Diseases

Area 2.3.1 HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis

Area 2.3.3: Potentially new and re-emerging epidemics

Area 2.3.4 Neglected infectious diseases

European Commission
Research DG
Health Directorate
Infectious Diseases Unit





Key documents to familiarise yourself with

Available for downloading on the same site as this briefing:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/infectious-diseases/emerging-epidemics/call-evaluation_en.html

- **Work Programme** listing the specific topics
 - HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis: pages 20-22;
 - Potentially new and re-emerging epidemics : pages 23-25
 - Neglected Infectious Diseases: pages 25-27

→ Full detailed text of the call topic to which the applicants submitted their proposal. The relevance of the proposal to this topic is partially reflected in scores for criteria 1 (S+T excellence)





Key documents to familiarise yourself with

Available for downloading on the same site as this briefing:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/infectious-diseases/emerging-epidemics/call-evaluation_en.html

Guides for applicants for the respective funding scheme of your topic (Network of Excellence – NoE or Collaborative projects – CP or coordination and support action (CSA))

→ What the applicants were asked to submit

- And also: ***Rules for submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures***

→ Full set of official rules related to the entire procedure





Conflict of Interest

- **Definition of conflict of interest: please see the first page of Annex I to your appointment letter**
- **If you discover actual or potential conflict of interest, please inform immediately the EC scientific officer responsible for your topic and discuss how to proceed**



Evaluation Procedure

- Each proposal is being evaluated individually by a minimum of 3 (in practice mostly 5-7) experts. Each evaluator submits a written thorough individual assessment report (IAR) (Step 1)
- Some or all of the experts who have reviewed the proposal come to Brussels for a „consensus group“ meeting (Step 2), in which all proposals submitted to the same or to several related topics are discussed and compared. On the basis of the IARs, a consensus report (CR) with consensus scores is agreed upon and forms the basis for feedback to the applicants.
- A „final panel“ with one representative from each consensus group, puts together the final ranking list of all proposals submitted to the same budget line.



Evaluation procedure

Proposal submission

Eligibility check¹

¹Already done by Commission: submitted in time, minimum number of participants, EC financial contribution thresholds respected

eligible

1. Individual evaluation (Step 1)

Your current role!

not eligible

2. Consensus Group meeting (Step 2)

If above threshold

3. Panel Evaluation

If below threshold

Priority list

Ethical review (if necessary)

Commission: final ranking list and decision

Rejection

Reserve list

Funding



FP7 funding schemes and their objectives

Networks of Excellence, NoE (1)

- designed for research institutions willing to **combine and functionally integrate in a durable way well defined parts of their activities and capacities in a given field**, with a view to creating a virtual European 'excellence centre' of research in the respective thematic field.
- implementation of a "**Joint Programme of Activities**" (JPA): based on the integrated and complementary use of resources from the research units, departments, laboratories or large teams involved in the scheme such as mutual access to infrastructure, equipment, material, data and knowledge; joint training schemes; exchanges of researchers, managers and technicians; redesign of the research portfolios and the research priorities, and reallocation of the resources in a way allowing to increase the number and the quality of the results produced, while optimizing the use of the participants' capacities



FP7 funding schemes and their objectives

Networks of Excellence, NoE (2)

- go far beyond the kind of cooperation associated with single projects, in terms of the range of objectives, number of researchers, and volume of activities, depth and duration of the cooperation
- proposals for NoEs should be supported by research managers at the higher level of responsibility in their respective home institutions, so as to ensure the necessary decisions in terms of staff, equipment and research policy can be taken to implement the Joint Programme of Activities



FP7 funding schemes and their objectives

Collaborative Project, CP (1)

- Objective driven research projects aiming at developing new knowledge, new technology, products, and that may include scientific coordination, demonstration activities or sharing of common resources for research in order to improve European competitiveness or to address major societal needs.
- Size, scope and internal organisation of collaborative projects should be compatible with overall objective and manageability of the whole endeavour and can vary from research theme to research theme and from topic to topic.
- Maximum (and minimum) amount of EC contribution is fixed for each topic in work programme (EUR 3 million, 6 million or 12 million): see page 7 and „call fiches“ appended to the work programme.



FP7 funding schemes and their objectives

Collaborative Project, CP (2)

- The activities to be carried out in the context of a collaborative project should include:
 - RTD as the core activities of the project
 - (demonstration activities)
 - Management activities
 - Other activities (training, dissemination, ethics, gender action etc.)



FP7 funding schemes and their objectives

Coordination action, CA

- “Co-ordination (or networking) actions” that cover not the research itself, but the coordination and networking of projects, programmes and policies.
- This includes, for example:
 - coordination and networking activities, dissemination and use of knowledge
 - support for transnational access to major research infrastructures
 - actions to stimulate the participation of SMEs, civil society and their networks
 - support for cooperation with other European research schemes(e.g. “frontier research”).
- Coordination actions are expected to have a duration of typically two to four years, while support actions are expected to have a shorter duration from some months to two to four years. However,there will be no formal minimum or maximum duration.



Evaluation principles

- **Excellence**
- **Transparency**
- **Confidentiality**
- **Impartiality**
- **Efficiency**



Definition of criteria Networks of Excellence

<i>Evaluation criteria applicable to Networks of Excellence proposals</i>		
S/T QUALITY	IMPLEMENTATION	IMPACT
<p>“Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)”</p>	<p>“Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”</p>	<p>“Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives• Contribution to long-term integration of high quality S/T research• Quality and effectiveness of the joint programme of activities and associated work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including ability to tackle fragmentation of the research field, and commitment towards a deep and durable institutional integration)• Adequacy of resources for successfully carrying out the joint programme of activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity• Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and disseminating knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large.



Definition of criteria Collaborative projects

Evaluation criteria applicable to Collaborative project proposals

S/T QUALITY “Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)”	IMPLEMENTATION “Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”	IMPACT “Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives• Progress beyond the state-of-the-art• Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and associated work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance)• Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity• Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property.



Definition of criteria Coordination actions

<i>Evaluation criteria applicable to Coordination and support actions (Coordinating)</i>		
S/T QUALITY	IMPLEMENTATION	IMPACT
“Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)”	“Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”	“Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives • Contribution to the co-ordination of high quality research • Quality and effectiveness of the co-ordination mechanisms, and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment ...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity • Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and disseminating knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders, and the public at large.





Criterion	Score	Threshold
1. S&T excellence*	0 to 5	3
2. Implementation and management	0 to 5	3
3. Potential impact**	0 to 5	3
TOTAL	0 to 15	10

*When a proposal is partially relevant/out of scope because it only marginally addresses the call topic, or if only part of the proposal addresses the topic, this condition must be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion.

**One of the subcriteria mentions '*Expected impact listed in Work Programme*'. The expected impact for each area can be found either at the area or at the topic level in the workprogramme.



Interpretation of scores

5	EXCELLENT: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor
4	VERY GOOD: the proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible
3	GOOD: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary
2	FAIR: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
1	POOR: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
0	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or can not be judged due to missing or incomplete information

Each criterion is scored between 0-5; half-marks are possible



Quality of the evaluation: your IAR

- First your written arguments, then the scores
- A total score is calculated for each proposal, by summing the three scores
- **Use the full range of scores (i.e. give low scores if appropriate!)**
- Written comments **must** be consistent with the scores

How to improve IAR:

- Positive comments - high score! Negative comments - low score!
- Avoid personalizing the comments!
“**This proposal is...**” rather than “**I think that....**”
- **YES: a clear assessment of the proposal!**
- **YES: extended feedback on weaknesses & strengths!**
- **YES: justification!**
- **NO: only 1-2 lines of general statements!**
- **NO: recommendations in view of resubmission!**



Small and medium enterprise (SME)

- **SME = small and medium sized enterprises:**
 - Fewer than 250 employees
 - Annual turnover < €50 million
 - Not owned for >25% of capital or voting rights by another enterprise
- **Strongly encouraged wherever appropriate. SME participation is among the criteria to be assessed !**



Important ethical issues should be considered when proposals involve:

- Human beings, personal data or genetic information
- Biological samples from human beings (from biopsies, blood or from embryos/fetuses)
- Animal research, especially non-human primates or laboratory animals such as dogs and pigs
- Projects involving human **stem cells** of different origin are eligible for funding, but only if the research described does not concern:
 - **Human reproductive cloning**
 - **Germline gene therapy (except cancer treatment of the gonads)**
 - **Creation of human embryos solely for research purposes or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer**



International Co-operation

- Participants from member states of European Union, candidate countries, associated states and international organisations of European interest: **funded**
- Participants from international cooperation partner countries (ICPC = all developing countries and emerging economies including Russia, China, India etc.): **funded**
- US participants are treated like participants from EU member states: **funded**
- Participants from third countries, such as Canada, Australia, Japan, South Korea, etc: **only funded if their participation is considered necessary for carrying out the research**



- **Technical questions** related to RIVET (e.g. trouble logging in with your password) please contact the RIVET helpdesk: servicedesk@ess-fp7.org or +32(0)2 506.10.80 (Mon-Fri 08h00 to 20h00 Brussels time, Sat 9-17h00 and closed on Sunday)
- **Administrative questions** (reimbursement, paperwork) please contact the EC staff indicated in the cover letter sent with your appointment letter
- **Content of the evaluation**, please contact the EC scientific officer indicated in the cover letter sent with your appointment letter